

THE REMONSTRANCE

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, JANUARY, 1918

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states. Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other Publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and forty-six Branch Committees; 41,300* members in 443 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. STEPHEN S. FITZGERALD, President
MRS. THOMAS ALLEN } Acting Vice-Presidents
MRS. BENJAMIN A. NORTON }
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ }
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY }
MISS ANNA L. DAWES }
MRS. LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM } Vice-Presidents
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD }
MRS. CURTIS GUILD }
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL }
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL }
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY }
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
Walnut Street, Brookline

Education and Organization Committee

Chairman
MRS. THOMAS NELSON PERKINS

Publicity Committee

Chairman
MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Membership Committee

Chairman
MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

Meetings Committee

Chairman
MRS. HAROLD MURDOCK

Public Interest League

President
MRS. B. L. ROBINSON

College Anti-Suffrage League

President
MRS. HERBERT LYMAN

Recording Secretary
MRS. RANDOLPH FROTHINGHAM

Corresponding Secretary
MRS. A. H. PARKER

*Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

MEMBERS ARE EARNESTLY REQUESTED TO KEEP HEADQUARTERS ADVISED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS.

A TIME TO GO SLOWLY

Massachusetts voters, legislators and Congressmen may expect a vehement "drive" this year from the suffragists. They will be told that Massachusetts ought not to lag behind, but that she should make haste to follow the example of New York.

New York, under the special impetus of the anti-war Socialist vote, has taken a leap over the precipice. Is it really desirable that Massachusetts should do the same?

Reasonable men will surely see that the present crisis in national affairs, so far from being, as the suffragists insist, the "time of times to smash through" the suffrage programme, is the time of times to go slowly.

The suffrage victory in New York is a calamity. But there is one advantage to be derived from it. It will afford the first opportunity that has been given for watching the practical results of woman suffrage in a largely populated Eastern State.

What the women have done with their votes in Nevada or Montana or Colorado or California is a matter of slight importance by comparison with the question of what they will do with them in New York. Can they "make good" there any of their promises of purer politics, better government, more just legislation? Can they bring to the polls regularly enough good, intelligent and disinterested women to offset the enormous accession of strength to the bosses and gangsters and sinister interests of all kinds through the doubling of the corrupt, purchasable and vice-ridden vote? And, if they could do this, would it not be at the cost of the complete exhaustion of the women, and their

neglect of far more important work?

These are questions which only time can answer. But they must be answered and answered in the affirmative before New York can be held up as an example for other Eastern States to follow. New York from now on will be the great object lesson of the workings of woman suffrage. The *Remonstrance* does not hesitate to say that if, in the government of the State at large and in the administration of the great cities, the reforms and improvements which the suffragists have confidently predicted should be realized, they would constitute a strong argument for suffrage. But if the Bath-house Johns and Hinky Dinks and their cohorts are strongly reenforced by the women's votes that will be another matter. It is true that Dr. Anna Shaw declares that "Facts as to the results of equal suffrage have no bearing upon our question," and that Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt insists that the question what women will do with the ballot and what good it will do "is no one's business."

But to the average, sane citizen and to all lovers of good government, it matters a good deal. All such citizens, in Massachusetts and other States, may well reply to the vehement demands of the suffragists: "Give us time to see how suffrage works out in New York, and then we will make up our minds."

A SUFFRAGE-SOCIALIST VICTORY

Stated in the simplest terms, the adoption of the woman-suffrage amendment to the New York Constitution at the election on the 6th of November was a suffrage-socialist victory.

It was a victory which the suffragists owe primarily to the Socialists of New York city. As every one knows, every Socialist is a suffragist. The phenomenal increase in the Socialist vote in New York city from 31,788 in 1916 to 142,178 last November meant an addition of more than 110,000 votes to the suffrage total. Without these 110,000 additional votes, the suffrage amendment would have been beaten. This is not a matter of inference or conjecture, but of simple mathematics.

It follows, of course, that the New York City Socialists, who have given the State over to the suffragists, will expect a reward for their service. It follows also that, at the next election, the actual voting strength of the Socialists will be doubled by the addition of the votes of Socialist women. These women, it may safely be assumed, will not be diffident about using their new privilege. The Socialist campaign in New York City was distinctly an anti-war, pro-German campaign. The candidate for Mayor was a man who made his opposition to the draft, and his refusal to buy a Liberty Bond his chief grounds for appealing for support. Women wearing sashes bearing the words "Have mercy on your wife and family. Vote the straight Socialist ticket" hovered about the booths, buttonholing the voters, and urging them to vote for the Socialist candidates.

It would be idle to predict the outcome of this Socialist-Suffragist alliance, but most sane Americans will see in it a menace to American institutions and to good government, and a drift toward irresponsibility and hysteria.

HALF A MILLION STAY-AT-HOMES

The New York election reinforces a lesson often taught before, that a light vote plays into the hands of the suffragists.

There is no eastern, middle or

southern state in which anti-suffragists have anything to dread from a full expression of the electorate. It is only when a considerable number of voters, for one reason or another, do not go to the polls, that there is danger that the suffragists may carry their measures.

This is what happened in New York. Outside of New York City, where the excitement over the mayoralty contest drew out a full vote, there was no active contest over offices. There were only three state officers to be chosen — two Associate Justices of the Court of Appeals, and the Attorney General. These are not offices over which the man in the street becomes excited. The candidates are mere names to him; and the offices themselves have little to do with politics. The man in the street was thinking of war questions, of finance, of industry, of the high cost of living, of wages. So he did not take the trouble to go to the polls. To the number of almost exactly half a million, he stayed away. In the Presidential election of 1916, the vote of New York was 1,706,305. On the suffrage question last November, only a trifle over 1,200,000 voted.

Doubtless, a good many thousand of these indifferent and careless voters regretted their carelessness the next day, when they saw the result of their folly. They will have increasing reason to regret it, as the years go by, and the results of doubling the electorate by the introduction of a million and a half to two million inexperienced, easily-influenced, and largely unwilling voters become apparent. The forces of evil, which were so swift to organize in Chicago, after women were given the municipal vote, will not be long inactive in New York.

It will be said that regrets are vain. So they are, so far as New York is concerned. But the lesson should be taken to heart in other states. In whatever state this ques-

tion is submitted to the voters, every effort should be made to secure the largest possible vote. The disaster in New York places upon all anti-suffragists and all lovers of good government a grave and pressing duty.

A MESSAGE TO CONGRESSMEN

At the New England Conference held at the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Headquarters, December 7th, the following resolution was adopted and telegraphed to all New England Congressmen:

Resolved: That since Woman Suffrage has been rejected by big majorities in every New England State where the question has been submitted to the people, and

Since both the Democratic and Republican platforms affirm that the question is one for the States to decide, and

Since taking the decision of this question away from the people is directly in opposition to the principles of democracy,

Therefore, this Convention of members from six New England States representing 100,000 women urges each Representative in Congress to do his utmost to defeat the Federal Suffrage Amendment.

Mrs. Clarence Hale,
Pres. Maine Anti-Suffrage Asso'n
Mrs. Rowland C. Hazard,
Pres. R. I. Asso'n
Mrs. A. T. Dudley,
Pres. N. H. Asso'n
Mrs. S. S. Fitzgerald,
Pres. Mass. Asso'n
Mrs. W. S. Fenton,
Pres. Vermont Asso'n
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham,
Pres. Conn. Asso'n

"THE LADY AND THE TIGER"

It was under the above heading that a correspondent of the *New York Evening Post* (suffragist), writing on the 8th of November, described the suffrage victory in New York:

"Tammany and female suffrage! A glorious pair! May they live long and prosper together! Though perchance, one might think that even a suffragist would blush (if that were possible) in being wafted to victory in the arms of Murphy."

A TIME TO STAND FAST

Massachusetts anti-suffragists and those in other non-suffrage states do not need to be told that this is a time to stand fast by their convictions and to increase, rather than relax their exertions.

Good fighters are not in the habit of giving up their cause after a single defeat. The suffrage victory in New York was won under exceptional conditions. As shown by the figures elsewhere quoted, it was practically handed to the suffragists by the Socialists of New York City. It does not point to any change of sentiment in the electorates of other States. Only two months before, Maine — a State which the suffragists had counted confidently on carrying — defeated a suffrage amendment by a nearly two-to-one majority; and, on the same day that New York voted for suffrage, Ohio rejected it by a heavy majority. The standards and ideals for which anti-suffragists stand remain precisely what they were. The perils to society and good government through an untrained and fitful women's vote are emphasized rather than diminished by the result in New York.

It is true that Massachusetts anti-suffragists, and those in other States, are greatly absorbed in war-relief activities. They are giving time and strength to all the organizations for supplying our soldiers with necessities and comforts, for lightening their burdens, for brightening their life in camp and in the trenches, and for protecting them against moral evils. All of these activities must grow more and more exacting as the war goes on. The *Remonstrance* would not wish a single anti-suffragist to relax her exertions in any one of them.

If the suffragists had been so minded, we might have had a truce in suffrage campaigns during the war; in which case all groups of women might have concentrated their strength and worked together to meet the war demands. Instead

of that, the suffragists chose to put suffrage first and the country second.

This decision forces anti-suffragists to remember that, pressing and strenuous as the war demands are, they cannot put wholly out of sight other demands which touch things that are fundamental. The war will end sometime: no one can confidently predict when. Victory will come to the cause for which we are fighting. But, when the war is over, and our soldiers and sailors come back, we want them to come back to a country with the best government and the best institutions to be anywhere found.

To this end, Massachusetts anti-suffragists must stand fast. They must not let a single disappointment discourage them. Consecrated as they are to war activities, they must still find some time to give to the cause which stands for good government and the highest interests of womanhood.

AGAINST SUFFRAGE PACIFISM

At a Conference at Washington on the 22d of November of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, at which representatives were present from twenty-five State Associations, and over which Mrs. James W. Wadsworth presided, a new platform was adopted, which emphasized some of the issues arising from the New York election. The platform was in these words:

That in the recent election in New York State woman suffrage was carried by the increased pro-German, pacifist and Socialist vote cast in New York City.

That the suffrage victory in New York has caused suffragists, Socialists and pacifists to demand the immediate passage of the Federal Suffrage amendment.

That the present Constitution of the United States and the Constitutions of the several States and the national platforms of both great parties "recognize the right of each State to settle this question for itself."

That the passage of the proposed Federal amendment would encour-

age all pro-Germans, pacifists and Socialists of both sexes in their demands for a national referendum on the war.

That such a referendum could lead only to a division of public opinion and become an instrument for the encouragement of resistance to the selective draft and to army discipline.

That the Federal suffrage amendment is undemocratic and unjust, a destruction of the right of self-government and would tremendously increase racial problems and all other problems of American democracy; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the oath administered to all members of Congress and officers of the United States Government "to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all foreign and domestic enemies" morally and truly applies to the present Constitution and to the proposed Federal Suffrage amendment.

PESTERING THE PRESIDENT

(From the *New York Times*, Nov. 11, 1917)

Fresh from the triumph of suffrage by State action, by the voice of the people, especially the Socialist people of New York, the woman suffrage leaders go to Washington to pester the President to support suffrage by Federal amendment. They calmly ask him to kick away the promise of his party in its national convention of 1916:

"We recommend the extension of the Franchise to the women of the States upon the same terms as to men."

They ask him, as they have often asked him, to give up his own deliberate position, reiterated in vain. In September, before the Maine election, at which woman suffrage was beaten nearly 2 to 1, Mr. Wilson wrote the Chairman of the Maine Suffrage Campaign Committee:

"The pledges of my party are very distinct in favor of granting the suffrage to women by State action."

On October 25, in a speech at Washington to representatives of the New York State Woman Suffrage Party, he said, not "merely as the spokesman of a party" but speaking for himself, that "this is the time for the States of this Union to take this action." The suffrage leaders seem to regard the mandate of his party as a scrap of paper and his settled judgment as a whim that a delegation of pretty or pertinacious women can coax him out of.

THE INDIANA DECISION

The decision of the Indiana Supreme Court, invalidating the woman suffrage law enacted by the Legislature of 1917, is searching and unequivocal, and leaves no loophole through which any future Legislature might attempt to slip any similar enactment. The test case which came before the Court was brought to prevent the Indianapolis election commissioners from preparing ballots for women at the approaching municipal election; but the decision of the Court denies to the women of the entire state the right to vote under the law for any public officer.

The decision is based on the second section of the second Article of the State Constitution, which directs that "in all elections not otherwise provided for by this Constitution, every male citizen of the United States, of the age of twenty-one years and upward . . . shall be entitled to vote in the township or precinct where he may reside."

The Court holds that "the right of suffrage is not a natural or inherent right, but a political privilege, and it is held only by those on whom it is bestowed, either by virtue of express constitutional grant, or through authorized legislative provision. The question is primarily one for the consideration of the people in their capacity as creators of the Constitution, and is never one for the consideration of the Legislature except in so far as that instrument clearly sanctions an extension of the elective franchise or permits a regulation of its mode of exercise." The Court makes short work of the suffrage contention that the section of the Constitution which empowers the Legislature to direct the "manner" in which certain officers should be chosen allows the Legislature to create a new electorate. It says on this point: "The right to determine the 'manner' in which public officers are to be chosen has reference only to the

method or mode of selection, and does not include the power to determine the qualifications of the legal voters."

The whole structure of "statutory suffrage" for women is toppled over by the Court in the statement that "The bare fact, standing alone, that one officer is named in the Constitution and the other is not, affords only an arbitrary ground for distinction as to who may participate in their election. . . . It is clear that any effort on the part of the General Assembly to establish a public electorate which would differ from that defined in Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution, must necessarily be in conflict with the manifest purpose of that section." The application of this principle to the Illinois partial-suffrage law would certainly invalidate it.

The suffragists appear to have jumped to the conclusion that at least so much of the statute as essayed to give women the right to vote for Presidential electors remained intact. But they can hardly have read the full text of the decision, or they would not cherish that hope. The question of Presidential suffrage was not directly before the Court in the case under consideration; but the concluding paragraph of the decision says plainly: "Where valid and invalid enactments are so connected one with the other that it is apparent that the Legislature would not have passed the Act, except as a whole, *the entire statute must fall.*"

WHAT IT COSTS IN MONEY

Suffragists are in the habit of dismissing lightly and contemptuously the objection that giving women the ballot involves a large increase in the cost of elections. All it means, they say, is the printing of more ballots and the hiring of a few more election officials—a negligible matter.

But the state of Illinois furnishes an opportunity for a practical test of this question. According to the official report of Chief Clerk Egan of the Board of Election Commissioners of Chicago, the total election expenses due to the women's vote, the first year that women voted, amounted to \$737,651.97. This was an average expense of \$2.44 for each of the 283,932 women who voted.

And what do the city and state get in return for all this cost? Upon that point, Clerk Egan says frankly:

"There are nearly as many women qualified to register as men; but since the novelty of the thing has worn off, they don't vote, except on big issues or on some sentimental question. They voted pretty well for Mayor two years ago, and a lot of them voted for Presidential Electors last year, but as a general thing they don't vote on the things that are of the most important concern to the tax-payers, such as bond issues and propositions."

The women voters do not exert an appreciable influence upon the elections. As a rule, the result of the elections is precisely what it would have been if the women had not voted. In 1916, 566,937 Illinois men and 383,292 women voted for President Wilson, and 693,334 men and 459,215 women for Mr. Hughes. The difference between the plurality percentage of the men and women was only 1.6 per cent. In 1915, Mayor Thompson, whose vehement pro-Germanism has carried him so far that he refused last year to receive Marshal Joffre, received 60.9 per cent. of the men's vote, and 65.5 per cent. of the women's vote. This is only a small difference; but, such as it is, it does not give the suffragists anything to exult over.

At a moderate estimate, on the basis of the experience of Illinois, giving women the vote will add at least \$3,000,000 to the annual election expenses in New York. And, also on the basis of the experience of Illinois, there will be no appreciable public advantage to show for it.

THE MASK THROWN OFF

Before the New York election, Mrs. Ida Husted Harper expressed warm appreciation of the work which the Socialists were doing for suffrage, and declared that, if the leaders of other political parties were equally active, the suffrage amendment was certain to be adopted.

But, now that the election figures show that the amendment would have been lost if it had not been for the majority given it in New York City, and that this majority was more than accounted for by the gain of 110,000 in the Socialist vote of New York City, the suffragists are keeping very quiet regarding their alliance with the Socialists and are not at all anxious to advertise the source of their strength. The *New York Call*, the Socialist organ, gently derides their reticence. It sees no further need of concealment. In its "Editorial Comment" in its issue for Nov. 18, it says:

"Now that the fight for the vote is over, there is just one question the Socialist women of New York are asking, and that is: *'How can we best win women to Socialism and to the Socialist party?'*

Not that we Socialist women have not always tried to win women to Socialism, even while we were trying to make suffragists of them. *In fact, it was always this ulterior propaganda of ours that made the mere suffragists dread and avoid entangling alliances with us even more than we did with them, if that were possible.*

But the gaining of the vote has changed all that. We Socialist women no longer want and need one specific thing in common with all women. *We now want and need something in common with all Socialists and members of the working class — men as well as women — namely, Socialism.*

The confusion, anarchy and disgrace which the Bolsheviks have brought upon Russia are an object lesson of the fruits of extreme Socialism. The Socialists for whom the *New York Call* speaks are the American Bolsheviks. Easy-going

suffragists, who have been led by vague claims and glittering generalities to support the suffrage movement, are destined to some painful surprises when the Socialist-suffrage alliance develops its programme more fully.

A NEW AND SERIOUS PROBLEM

Thoughtful men and women in New York are beginning to realize the seriousness of the problem resulting from putting the ballot in the hands of hundreds of thousands of foreign-born women, many of whom do not speak English, have never met the tests of citizenship, and are far from being equipped to do so.

New York is the first of the great immigration States to impose upon women the vote. There are more than 1,069,000 women over twenty-one years of age in the State who are foreign-born. Many of them have become citizens automatically through the naturalization of their husbands or by marrying Americans. Naturalized by a method which does not include an oath of allegiance to the United States, and with sons, husbands and brothers on both sides of the European battle line, it becomes a serious question what the attitude of these women will be toward the war, and whether they will back the President in it. The National Americanization Committee, which is trying to arouse the people of New York to the urgent need of reaching and enlightening the new immigrant electorate, says:

"The situation is without precedent, and the instruments of Americanism not easy to find. Here are gathered together, especially among the Slav and Italian races, women who are less Americanized than the men of their families, more ignorant of English, with a higher degree of illiteracy, and, most important, a more deep-seated opposition to the adoption of American ideals, institutions and traditions. These women have been and are a fertile field for un-American propaganda."

For precipitating this peril upon the city and State of New York, and indirectly upon the nation at large, in the midst of the great war, the Socialist-Suffrage alliance is responsible. But it is precisely what the Socialists want; and as for the suffragists, they apparently do not care.

PROVING THEIR UNFITNESS

(From the *New York Herald*, Nov. 13, 1917)

The one thing which the suffrage pickets at the White House and their supporters appear to be accomplishing is establishing proof that they lack fitness to exercise the franchise which they hope to obtain or already have obtained.

Do they not know, can they not understand, that this union of sovereign States is based upon and derives its existence from certain constitutional forms? Do they not know that one of the rights of each of these sovereign States is that of deciding what shall be the qualifications of voters? Do they not know that the President is not an absolute monarch, that he is not the Congress, that he is not a constitutional convention, that he is not the Legislature of any one State, let alone the Legislature of every State? Do they not understand that he did for them all that he could do when he publicly urged the men to extend the franchise to them? Yet in the face of these facts they attempt by force to compel him to violate the very constitution, the very principles of law, by which this union of States exists. Their spirit is akin to the spirit of the I. W. W., to the spirit of the Bolsheviks, the spirit of Prussianism — spirits which would compel that which they want without regard to methods and measures properly provided.

THE *New York Evening Post* is in error in stating that the Vermont Legislature last year gave the women of that State municipal and Presidential suffrage. The Legislature passed a municipal suffrage bill — limited to tax-paying women — but, eight days later, it killed a Presidential Suffrage Bill.

NOT "HAND IN HAND"

The claim which some misguided suffragists are in the habit of making, — that suffrage and temperance go "hand in hand," has received another knock-down blow in the result of the Ohio election.

The same electorate, voting on the same day on woman suffrage and on prohibition, rejected woman suffrage by a majority of 137,000, and came within less than 1,200 votes of accepting prohibition.

This difference is the more striking because the Ohio suffragists had professed to believe that the referendum which brought the suffrage measure before the voters last November was a sinister device of the saloon interests. If that were true, the temperance voters would certainly have been aroused, and they would have rallied to the support of woman suffrage in substantially the same strength which enabled them almost to carry the prohibition amendment. The two proposals would have gone "hand in hand."

Instead of this, the same phenomenon occurred which marked the election of 1914 when, as last November, the questions of suffrage and prohibition went to the voters on the same day. The day after the 1914 election, in Ohio, Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton, President of the Ohio Suffrage Association, telegraphed — with a candor which she very likely has regretted — "*Drys did not generally vote with us.*" The official figures abundantly confirmed the statement; for the majority against suffrage was nearly 100,000 larger than the majority against prohibition, and there were 58 counties which voted against suffrage but in favor of prohibition. The detailed official figures of last November's election show a similar grouping of counties which voted for prohibition but against suffrage.

It is probable that the Ohio voters have not yet forgotten the coquetting of the suffrage leaders with the saloon interests in 1914.

Early in that campaign, Mrs. Upton published officially the following statement:

"Let me explain that the suffrage association is not a temperance organization. *It has no connection whatever with the Anti-Saloon League.* When women vote they will be free to take sides on the liquor question. Many of them doubtless will vote dry. *Many others will vote wet.*"

The Ohio Prohibitionists could not fail to see that Mrs. Upton, the suffragist leader, was trying to keep on the right side of the liquor interests, and to persuade them that they had nothing to fear from women's votes. The impression made by this suffrage duplicity seems to have lingered in the minds of the voters, and it explains the overwhelming suffrage defeat of last November.

"INSEPARABLE COMPANIONS"

The *New York Call*, the Socialist organ which the United States Government has excluded from the mails because of its seditious utterances, in its issue the day after the New York election said:

"*Socialism and suffrage, inseparable companions in revolutionary political thought and action, have triumphed in the election in New York city and state.*"

That is not the way in which Miss Blackwell, although herself a Socialist, would express the significance of the election; but that is because Miss Blackwell is restrained by prudence, and the *New York Call* is not. The true meaning of the suffrage victory in New York could not be better expressed in a few words than in the paragraph quoted from the *Call*.

Another aspect of the victory won by these "inseparable companions in revolutionary political thought and action" is indicated in the following statement by the *Call*:

"*The whole Socialist campaign was waged squarely on the issue of an early peace for all the warring nations. . . . Suffrage is regarded by many radicals as the greatest step toward peace that could have been made.*"

The *Call* frankly indicates what it looks for from the suffrage victory. It says that "With the workingwomen of New York enfranchised, it will eventually be of tremendous benefit to the Socialist party, because all its adherents will be expected to vote faithfully each election"; and it predicts that, after the workingwomen are naturalized, "the Socialist party in this city will be unbeatable."

Here we have the meaning of what happened in New York on the 6th of November: Socialism; Pacifism; and the triumph of "revolutionary political thought and action." It is safe to say that many thousands of the men who voted for suffrage in New York, without realizing the significance of the Socialist-suffrage alliance, will repent their folly before the year is past. Not a few of them already regret it.

SUFFRAGE BY COERCION

(From the *New York Times*, Nov. 11, 1917)

The solid, the impregnable reasons for letting the States decide for themselves whether they want or do not want women to vote, will not disappear. Baffled in Ohio, where the Socialists, so helpful in New York, were beaten in the cities, the feminists would force suffrage upon that unwilling State. They would force it on Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Iowa, the South. The two little States of Montana and Nevada are, with the exception of New York, the only States that have voted for suffrage since the close of 1912 and fourteen States have voted against it. Conscious of their weakness at the polls, the suffragists have played upon the weakness of the politicians in the Legislature. They depend upon that, upon their power to dazzle and persuade Legislatures, to attain Federal suffrage, suffrage by coercion.

THAT OBNOXIOUS WORD "MALE"

The Woman Citizen complains bitterly that "the Indiana courts of law have made mincemeat of Indiana women's political enfranchisement."

And why did they do it? Simply because they encountered, in the State Constitution, a definition of voters as "male citizens." The definition is in these words:

"In all elections not otherwise provided for in this constitution, every male citizen of the United States . . . shall be entitled to vote in the township or precinct where he may reside."

The October *Remonstrance* ventured to suggest that, when the framers of the Indiana Constitution wrote the words "male citizens" into that instrument, it was fair to conclude that they meant "male citizens." The word "male" was not inserted by accident. It has governed all elections in that state from that date to the present time. The idea that a single Legislature, without reference to the people, can wipe it out of the Constitution, is a revolutionary one.

The Indiana Supreme Court, in its decision of October 26, took exactly this view. It held that, under the Constitution which defines voters as "male citizens" the Legislature had no authority to confer the franchise upon women.

So passes into the scrapheap the so-called "nine-tenths suffrage law" over which the suffragists have exulted so joyously. That law attempted to give to Indiana women presidential and statutory suffrage, the right to vote for delegates to the proposed Constitutional Convention, and the right to vote upon the adoption of the Constitution which might be framed. But the Court refuses to sanction these revolutionary changes because of that obnoxious word "male."

And the suffragists are disturbed by the fact that the Constitution of North Dakota, where the Legislature enacted a Presidential Suffrage law, and that of Arkansas, where the Legislature passed a bill permitting women to vote at the primaries, contain the same obnoxious and obstructive word.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

At the annual meeting of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage at Washington, Dec. 12, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., was re-elected President, and Mrs. Robert Lansing, wife of the Secretary of State, Secretary. Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Mrs. John B. Heron, Miss Anne McIlvaine, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Mrs. H. E. Talbott and Mrs. N. C. Young were elected Vice-Presidents, and Miss Anne Squire, Treasurer. The Presidents of the South Dakota, Texas, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Connecticut, Vermont and Virginia Associations were chosen Directors for the term 1917-1920.

Mrs. Wadsworth, in her address emphasized especially the new reason for earnest work, that of patriotism and loyalty, since the new force that is driving the suffrage movement is the disloyal, pacifist vote. We must think of suffrage as one more evil to be combatted. Our slogan must be that of Verdun, — "They shall not pass." Mrs. Wadsworth's inspiring address was received with the utmost enthusiasm.

Miss Minnie Bronson, National Secretary, in her address, reviewed the fourteen defeats which suffrage measures have experienced at the polls during the last four years; and emphasized the significance of the overwhelming defeat in Ohio last November.

MASSACHUSETTS anti-suffragists were given an opportunity, on the 14th of December, of presenting to Representatives of that State in Congress reasons against the Federal amendment. Mrs. B. L. Robinson of Cambridge, Mrs. Henry Preston White of Brookline and Mrs. Edwin Ford of Chestnut Hill were the speakers. Mrs. Robinson said that sentiment in Massachusetts against suffrage had increased rather than diminished since the war began and

it was found that the suffrage-pacifist movement was pro-German. She charged that the suffragists, by demanding the ballot as a reward for war work, had put "pay" into "patriotism." Mrs. White punctured the argument of Mrs. Marion Booth Kelley that her husband and son, who had gone overseas, wanted her to represent them, by showing that the husband and son still have their vote. Mrs. Ford contrasted the suffrage and anti-suffrage points of view, and affirmed that women's greatest contribution to the public good can be made outside of politics.

TAMMANY AND SUFFRAGE

(From the *Springfield Union*, Nov. 12, 1917)

Promptly upon the woman suffrage victory in New York there has been initiated a movement to make that State "bone dry," it being believed that the women's vote will prove a great help toward that end. It is by no means clear that this expectation is well-founded, any more than it is assured that woman suffrage is going to be an advantage to the good government cause in the large cities. The "red light" and graft vote can be herded and delivered more readily than the good-government vote, considering the situation year in and year out, and it is quite possible that Tammany threw its influence for woman suffrage with that understanding.

WOMEN "IN ON JOBS"?

(From the *New York Mail*, Nov. 10, 1917)

"Women Must Be 'In on Jobs'" is the heading an evening newspaper puts on a leading article on the political situation.

It says "the voters will organize themselves, or be organized, into auxiliary groups by existing political parties."

Can this be true? Is this what the ballot means for women?

"In on jobs," "organized into auxiliary groups by existing political parties."

Will women ever permit themselves to be organized by the "Jake" Livingstons, the "Packy" McCabes the "Paddy" Sullivans, the "Charley" Murphys of "existing political parties"?

JUST THE SAME AS THE MEN

The *New York Evening Post*, ardent advocate of woman suffrage though it is, makes no attempt to show that any "uplift" comes to politics from the votes of women. On the contrary, it cites facts to prove that, in the long run, women vote just the same as men. In its issue for November 24, 1917, it said editorially:

"In Chicago's city elections, there are separate ballot-boxes for men and women, and thus an accurate comparison can be made between the two sets of votes. Once or twice the women have pulled a candidate through when he would have been defeated but for their vote. In each case the successful candidate had the endorsement of the Municipal Voters' League. But in general the women have voted very much like the men. In the notorious First Ward, they have added to the majority of the picturesque Hinky Dink, and in the almost equally notorious Nineteenth, Hull House has not been brought perceptibly nearer to victory over Aldermen of the stripe of John Powers. Nor have women lined up for certain reforms as a body. Last November, two States in which women vote, Idaho and Montana, adopted prohibition, and one, California, rejected it. Similarly, two States in which women do not vote, Michigan and Nebraska, went "dry," and one, Maryland, remained "wet."—Even upon the question of capital punishment women have not shown a tendency to vote differently from men. In 1914, with women voting, Arizona retained the death penalty by a majority of 1,252; in 1916, she abolished it by a majority of 152. The assertions about what women did in California last November are assertions and nothing more. There is no indication that they voted contrary to their husbands and sons."

Thus calmly but convincingly does the *New York Evening Post* cast away the favorite argument of the suffragists.

SOCIALISM AND FEMINISM

Students of modern political and social conditions will find an almost inexhaustible storehouse of facts and

arguments in the volume on "Feminism," in which Mr. Correa Moylan Walsh brings to a conclusion his study of the closely related subjects "Socialism and Feminism."

Mr. Walsh's point of view is that both socialism and feminism lead to complete demoralization; that beneath each of them is a new morality of sentiment, replacing the old morality of duty—of selfishness driving out the spirit of self-sacrifice; that woman suffragism is individualism run mad, and tending toward its opposite, collectivism.

Mr. Walsh's work is by all odds the most exhaustive and comprehensive that has been written upon either side of this subject. It might be said indeed to have been written on both sides of the subject—that is to say, he has adopted the method of following the history of the subject from the beginning of the feminist agitation to the present moment, stating fully and with careful citation of authorities, the arguments for feminism and for suffrage, and then reviewing them convincingly and caustically. The extent of the author's researches may be indicated by the fact that there are no less than 75 footnotes and quotations in the section on the "Views of Leading Feminists"—each with chapter and verse—69 in the section on "Woman Suffrage Arguments," 75 in that on "Women and Work," and so on. The two chapters on Woman Suffrage make a treatise complete in itself, and a very keen and exhaustive treatise it is. Whether for consecutive reading or for reference, Mr. Walsh's work, which is published by the Sturgis and Walton Company of New York, is an extremely valuable contribution to the literature of the subject.

OUT of 1,274 Maine soldiers in the cantonments who voted on the suffrage amendment last September, only 444 voted "Yes." Yet the suffragists profess to believe that they have the youth of the country with them.

SUFFRAGE DEFEATS LAST YEAR

In the Legislatures.

In Connecticut, the Legislature defeated a Presidential and Municipal Suffrage Bill, and a License Suffrage Bill. The House, by a vote of 136 to 96, passed a resolution to submit a suffrage amendment to the people, but this action was not taken seriously. According to *The Woman's Journal*, it was "partly due" to a feeling that the suffragists were afraid of a referendum.

In Delaware, a proposed constitutional amendment was defeated in both houses.

In Florida, a bill to submit a suffrage amendment was defeated in the Legislature.

In Georgia, a resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment was killed in the Legislature.

In Maryland, a Presidential Suffrage Bill was defeated.

In Massachusetts, the Woman Suffrage Committee of the Constitutional Convention voted against a suffrage amendment, 9 to 6.

In Minnesota, a Presidential suffrage Bill and a resolution to submit a Constitutional amendment were defeated in the Legislature.

In Missouri, a Presidential Suffrage Bill was killed in the Senate.

In New Hampshire, a Presidential and Statutory Suffrage Bill was defeated in both Houses.

In New Jersey, a Presidential Suffrage Bill was killed in the Assembly.

In New Mexico, a suffrage amendment resolution was defeated in the Legislature.

In Pennsylvania, a resolution for a re-submission of a suffrage amendment was defeated in the House, April 17.

In South Carolina, a resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment was defeated in the Legislature.

In Tennessee, a limited suffrage bill was defeated in the Senate, by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

In Texas, three suffrage bills were killed in the Legislature: one providing for the submission of a suffrage amendment; one for Presidential Suffrage; and one for voting in the primaries.

In Vermont, a Presidential suffrage Bill was killed.

In Wisconsin, a resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment was defeated.

In the Courts.

In Indiana, a bill to give women the right to exercise Presidential, county and municipal suffrage; to vote for delegates to a Constitutional Convention; and to vote on the Constitution, when submitted to the people was declared unconstitutional by the State Supreme Court.

At the Polls.

In Maine, a proposed suffrage amendment was submitted to the people at a state election, September 10, and was defeated by a vote of 20,604 in favor, 38,838 opposed, an adverse majority of 18,234.

In Ohio, a bill passed by the Legislature to give Presidential Suffrage to women was submitted to the voters, on a referendum petition, November 6, and was defeated by a vote of 422,262 to 568,382, an adverse majority of 146,120.